



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,433	09/30/2003	Sandeep K. Gopisetty	ARC920030047US1	3426
74660 7590 02/17/2010				
Gregory Smith 3900 Newpark Mall Road Suit 317 Newark, CA 94560				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, DUSTIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/17/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/676,433

Applicant(s)

GOPISETTY ET AL.

Examiner

DUSTIN NGUYEN

Art Unit

2454

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 9-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11 are presented for consideration

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rabe et al. [US Patent No 7,506,040].
3. As per claim 1, Rabe discloses the invention as claimed including a method for generating a network zone plan [the SAN management system may provide administrators or other users the ability to view complex SAN topologies, gather real-time information about SAN objects, and support zoning and LUN security] [Figure 5; col 12, lines 44-49; and col 13, lines 13-15], comprising:

collecting connectivity information using a plurality of software agents in every principal switch and host for devices in a storage network [i.e. the SAN management

system may automatically monitor switch and storage resources; and explorer may use a different method to discover information about objects on the SAN; sequence 530 may determine which explorers to use to collect information from the SAN components; and explorers may be categories into switch explorers, disk array explorers, and HBA explorers] [Figure 4; col 8, lines 60-63; col 12, lines 31-43; and col 17, lines 55-61];

reporting by the software agents the configuration data to a configuration database; reporting by the software agents the storage configuration of the host to a storage subsystem [i.e. explorers collect information from different SAN components and store in database] [col 12, lines 20-30; col 16, lines 17-34; and col 18, lines 4-col 19, lines 28]; and

performing an analysis on the collected information to infer relationships between the devices [i.e. acquisition and correlation of different topological data from the heterogeneous network; discovering objects and the relationship of these objects to each other] [col 7, lines 15-23; col 12, lines 25-30; and col 13, lines 56-67];

whereby the zone plan generator adds storage devices to existing zones or allocates a new zone plan based on user generated zone policies [i.e. zones and their member objects may be defined in zoning tables; and a system administrator may send instructions to controller via SAN manager to zone a storage device to a particular host] [col 12, lines 10-18; col 31, lines 29-59; and col 32, lines 38-col 33, lines 11].

4. As per claim 3, Rabe discloses wherein the zone plan dictates visibility of devices in the zone instead restricting within or between the zones [i.e. a zone is a set of

objects within a SAN fabric that can access one another] [col 31, lines 29-col 32, lines 37].

5. As per claim 4, Rabe discloses wherein size of the zone is an attribute specified by the system administrator [i.e. zones and their member objects] [col 31, lines 39-51].

6. As per claim 5, Rabe discloses wherein the storage relationship and network path connectivity between host and storage subsystem are done by correlating the information and by appropriate topological search [i.e. acquisition and correlation of different topological data from the heterogeneous network; discovering objects and the relationship of these objects to each other] [col 7, lines 15-23; col 12, lines 25-30; and col 13, lines 56-67].

7. As per claim 7, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Rabe discloses a set of instruction codes for identifying policies to be utilized in generating a zone plan of the network [Figs 18-20; and col 35, lines 6-col 39, lines 34].

8. As per claim 9, Rabe discloses wherein the data is collected from all devices in the SAN periodically or when a physical change in the configuration occurs [col 16, lines 13-16].

9. As per claim 10, Rabe discloses wherein the port-to-port connectivity's of the storage area network is inferred from the graph structure obtained as a result of the analysis [Figure 23; col 14, lines 64-col 15, lines 13; and col 18, lines 13-16].

10. As per claim 11, Rabe discloses wherein the granularity, devices, size, and type are the attributes used to generate zone policy [i.e. standard set of attributes for each type of object] [col 17, lines 55-col 19, lines 28].

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DUSTIN NGUYEN/

Application/Control Number: 10/676,433

Page 7

Art Unit: 2454

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454